

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

[CONTINUED.]

We think that it may be laid down as an axiom not likely to be disputed except by those who are interested in the matter in question, that nothing would be of greater use in the present day than to devise some effectual method by which the stability of Government might be increased.

In our last communication we called attention to the lamentable inefficiency of the Governments of the present day, and we showed that this debility of the Executive was not a necessary concomitant of a limited monarchy; that it was not, to use the language of logicians, a thing inherent in the essence of a free Constitution, but merely an accident; and we pointed out some instances of change from the ancient usage of Parliamentary proceedings which have in no small degree contributed to produce this undesirable consummation. We should like to know, among other things, how, when, and wherefore that most strange and eccentric custom was introduced by which the outgoing Minister in whom the Commons have declared they have no confidence is invited to nominate his successor. What can be imagined more inconsistent and irrational than this practice? You find it difficult to realise such an idea. To think that a Minister who has just been ejected from power, and is as it were disgraced,—that the very man who is supposed to be ousted for misconduct, and who, according to the constitutional theory deserves to be impeached, should at once proceed to advise the Crown on one of the most important and delicate questions that can in ordinary times arise,—that he should in fact exercise one of the highest prerogatives of the Crown,—this is truly a thing to make men wonder.

By some such contrivance it generally happens that only two men in the country are supposed capable of forming an Administration. Thus, in England we had for a long time Lord Melbourne, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Russell, Sir Robert Peel, and then Lord John Russell succeeded on the death of Lord Melbourne. In this colony we have had Mr. Cowper, Mr. Parker, and now Mr. Cowper again; and we shall probably have the same change every six months or so, *ad usque mensuram*. Formerly this was not the case, so late even as the good old days of George the Third. That mutinously obstinate monarch, who had peculiar notions of his prerogatives on other subjects besides this, where they exercised anything but a beneficial influence, would not have permitted himself to be dictated to for a moment in the choice of a minister; and he was undoubtedly right. It were far better that a man fifty times more dull, blind, and obstinate than George III. should appoint the Prime Minister who is to rule over us, than that he should be selected after the present fashion.

Surely the most unfit person of all others for the purpose is he who now virtually makes the appointment.

But the most mischievous and most obnoxious mode of proceeding is that by which a Ministry are kept continually at their posts whenever the House is sitting, involving as it does a serious loss of their time, and consequently hindrance of the public business. There they are compelled to sit hour after hour, listening to an endless flow of inane rapid talk, though in the mean time they may have important business on their hands elsewhere; for we presume that every one will allow that a Government should sometimes act, and that it should not at all times and places be exclusively given to talk. Not only the Ministry, but all their principal supporters, must be on the spot or within call of the whipper-in, in order to prevent a march being stolen upon them by their opponents when a great part of their phalanx is absent, or when some peddling motion or other, for which a Ministry may be numerically superior to its opponents, and though the latter may be very unwilling to try their strength by moving a direct vote of censure, they imagine if a majority can be snatched on one or two insignificant occasions, that all these little successes may by a sort of accumulative process be construed into something tantamount to a grand victory.

In order to gain these petty advantages any disreputable dodge may be tried, any paltry artifice may be made use of. If they cannot command success by driving their opponents out of office they are, at all events, sure of one great consolation, that of rendering Government as useless as possible, and the Prime Minister as uncomfortable as his worst enemies could desire. The seat of a Minister now a days is by no means a place of repose and pleasure; we marvel how they manage to survive the cares and the worry of office. Lord Palmerston, for instance, is undoubtedly a remarkable man. He is not, to be sure, a brilliant orator like Disraeli, or a profound scholar like Macaulay. His knowledge on deep and abstruse questions of political philosophy is supposed to be but limited and superficial. But he knows better than any man who it imports him most to know, the temper of the English nation, the House of Commons, the Court, and foreign affairs. He is an excellent tactician, a vigorous and ready debater, and a capital man of business. Few men in our time have done so much, yet no man seems to have had more leisure. He is positively overflowing with high spirits, and whether in Council, in the House, or in society, he is all life and energy. When we add to this, that he was the best waltzer of his day, the most unexceptionable "homme de société" that he can make by far the best post-prandial or post-nuptial oration that was ever heard, he may be reckoned truly a wonder. Yet we think the most remarkable fact about him is, that he is alive. He has positively been in Parliament about half a century, and more than half that time in office. When we consider what he must have undergone in that time, in listening for hours to hon. members pouring forth obvious common-place and fatulent eloquence—in being kept up till late hours of the night, when we can consider the absurd and the revolting he has had subjected to, and the hard work he has had to do, we may well pause and admire the *physique* of a man who is quite vigorous and juvenile at the age of 72. Yet, after all, a Minister's place in England must be Elysium itself to that of our Colonial Ministers. The House of Commons will not endure very bad speeches; here, no limitation is placed either on the quantity or quality of the talk. It may be possible that by some beneficent dispensation of Providence, as "the wind is tempered to the shorn lamb," the constitution of a minister may be rendered proof against afflictions which are wont in the case of other men to impair health and energy. We devoutly hope so. If it be not the case, we fear our Colonial Ministers will be not remarkable for longevity.

SCRIBLERUS.

MELBOURNE.

[FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.]

THURSDAY, 25th OCTOBER.—In the political world we are wholly destitute of excitement. The Electoral Act Amendment Bill passed the Council on Tuesday after a brief amount of conversation; for it was not a debate—and with a great many verbal amendments. The only new feature is the introduction of four new clauses—reducing the qualification for the franchise of the Upper House to that formerly required to vote for the return of a member to the Assembly. The educational qualification clause met with a slight opposition, on the ground that, although a man might not be able to read and write, he might be able to understand the relative qualification of two or more candidates. This was discussed by the *illuminati* of the Council in a very solemn way, but the clause was maintained as originally proposed. The Council has adjourned to next Tuesday, when, no doubt, the bill will be read a third time.

The Legislative Assembly building is being pulled to pieces, in order to light it from the exterior. The experiment has been tried on a small scale with great success. A great many alterations are in progress with reference to the refreshment rooms and lower offices. The reappearance of the small-pox, after it had been thought to have died out in Melbourne, has excited very serious apprehensions—not the less strong, perhaps, in consequence of the very obstinate and cruel conduct of some of the persons whose families are affected. Several cases have appeared in Jeffcott-street, North Melbourne, and these, as they occurred, have been promptly removed to a long distance from the city or any human habitation. In one case, however, where his family were attacked, a man, named Kirk, refused to allow the removal of his child. In consequence of this refusal, no one, except a medical practitioner, is allowed access to or egress from the premises. This was by an order of the Executive Council. The proceeding may seem an infringement on the liberty of the subject; but it is, in fact, in my opinion, a just protection to the public. It is a principle of law that a man's private rights and liberty extend just so far as they can be exercised without annoyance, injury, or danger to his neighbours. Here is an immense community threatened with a foul disease, and so far from extending any consideration to this person, he and all his family, ill or well, should be compulsorily removed.

Byron's tragedy of "Sardanapalus" has been produced with great splendour at the Theatre Royal—the pictorial effect being described as something grand in the extreme. Of course this has been done at an enormous outlay, and it is to be hoped that a manager will be amply rewarded for his great efforts by public patronage. It must be borne in mind, however, that Byron's tragedy is but ill-suited to the stage, and its representation must of necessity be a complete failure unless enormous resources are brought to bear upon it. Great care must be also used in the casting of the piece, and the selection of the actors. The powerful language of Byron is apt to suffer greatly under the least misapprehension, and a full comprehension of its beauty. In this respect the tragedy is somewhat deficient. Mrs. Heir made an excellent Myrrha, but Mr. G. V. Brooks was tame as the Assyrian monarch.

Monday Morning, 26th October. I find that my letter of Thursday last missed the steamer. The loss will scarcely be felt, as the three days of which it was the history were the duller of which. Very little has been done since to call for remark.

In politics there is still nothing of interest. People have been exhausted by the ferment on the Land Bill, and on the other exciting topics which have arisen during the last session. The probable changes in the Administration have excited very little attention, nor do I think that political or party feeling will be again aroused until the next Land Bill is introduced. Questions come on for discussion, but this is probably not until after Christmas—for as soon as the present session is closed—(which it will be soon after the reassembling of the Lower House)—Parliament will be called together again in order to get through the estimates for 1858 at once. This will be indispensable—unless it is intended that the money for the roads and bridges should be again applied during the winter of 1857-58. The only way to avoid this, if the estimate is not passed before Christmas, would be to delay these works, and this is a course not to be thought of in the present condition of the working classes of the colony.

No new cases of small-pox are reported, although a good deal of alarm still prevails. It is now believed that the disease will be confined to those already attacked, and that the infection will be extinguished on the commencement. It is to be hoped that the authorities at the Hotel have learned a lesson which will render them more cautious for the future. The captain of the Commodore Perry has been again examined at the Williamstown Police Court to-day, and the hearing further adjourned on the attendance of important witnesses. The doctor has made his escape from the colony. The affair has been hitherto considered a smart piece of business on the part of the captain and the doctor. Should the disorder spread any further, general indignation from the public will take the place of congratulations from congenial "salts."

A good deal of public indignation has been excited in consequence of a decision of the leading butchers and salaried to raise the price of meat nearly 2d. per lb. when the price stood at 10s. 6d. per lb. What increased charge. Letters from butchers in a comparatively small way of business are constantly appearing in the *Argus*, complaining of an organised system of gouging the public from purchasing cattle, unless they will follow the example set them by the leading butchers. They assert—and there can be no reason to doubt them—that they were, and are still quite content with the former prices, were so simply contented that they would not sell at 10s. 6d. per lb. of the sale of 100 sheep. As it is a very small business indeed that does not do 100 sheep in a fortnight, some idea may be formed as to the enormous profits of the business. As the foregoing calculation assumes that the butcher could not sell at 10s. 6d. per lb. at 7d. and 8d. may be imagined. Some talk is raised about forming an association similar to the "Bread League Company," in London, in order to prevent this disgraceful imposition on the public. It is greatly to be hoped that the idea will not be suffered to drop, for such a causeless increase must add considerably to the distress already existing, and compel many a poor family to restrict themselves in their use of wholesome animal food. It is urged that they can use bread and vegetables—a much more wholesome diet for a warm climate, but, unfortunately, bread is nearly as dear, and vegetables much dearer than meat, while fish is at an extravagant price.

Osborne is beginning his agitation again. In answer to the deputation to the President of the Board of Lands and Works, Mr. Moore replied with a distinct refusal to give the policy (if not the land) which was not in the bush—for this is the latest demand, as you are aware. Osborne thereupon, assembled about 150 malcontents in the Eastern Market, and addressed them on two or three occasions in a most inflammatory manner. He is reported to have advised the people to cling together. "What one does I'll do, and they cannot punish one or two thousand, but they could punish a few." He moreover asserted, as I am informed that he was willing to fight for his rights, that it was of no use doing so while they were so divided. This man, in spite of his cunning, seems determined to get himself within the grasp of the authorities, and if he does, the grasp will not be a very tender one. As a climax to the folly which he is now pursuing, he publicly hanged a copy of the *Argus* in the Eastern Market, and afterwards burned it. Fortunately, the mass of the formerly unemployed find it may be better to work than to idle, and the rage of a designing man, and unless important malice prompt him to the commission of some act which can be brought under the cognizance of the law, he is likely to die out, and be numbered amongst the stump orators "that were, and are not."

The mates of the Champion and Lady Bird have both been tried. The mate of the Lady Bird on Friday, and the mate of the Champion on Saturday. A verdict of acquittal has been recorded in both cases, and the jury returned the inference that the mates of the steamers, each lighting the other, on a clear night, at a distance of four miles, may run into each other, cause a great destruction of human life, and yet no one to be held responsible. The *Argus* and the *inquiry* have the view of the case contending that the inquiry made was too limited in its scope, and that unless juries are to adopt the system of fatalism they must have found out that blame rested somewhere. The reason why the officers of the vessels were tried separately was this. Each had been tried together, and the facts must have been examined on or other of them, while, being separately arraigned, on one trial all the blame was shown to rest with the Champion, and on

the other it was demonstrated that it rested with the Lady Bird. This may be in accordance with the law, but it looks very like an evasion of justice.

The rain is as dull as ever. The weather is unpropitiously lowering, and the roads are bad in some places and flooded in others.

No arrivals to-day.

L A W.

SUPREME COURT.—WEDNESDAY.

Baron the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Dickinson, Mr. Justice G. V. Brooks, Mr. Justice R. H. Dixon.

This was a demurrer to defendant's plea of justification in an action for libel. The libel declared upon was contained in certain letters from the defendant to the Postmaster-General, whereby the plaintiff, who was a country postmaster, was accused—first, of charging more than the authorised amount of postage; second, of keeping back from a letter named Gale, and of sending it to one named John, although Gale was, as the plaintiff knew, authorised to receive the same; such refusal to deliver the letter being made upon the ground that it contained an avowed statement of the defendant's libel. The defendant, besides pleading the plea of justification, also pleaded the plea of justification setting out with an avowment of the truth of the statements made in the letters said to be libellous, and concluding with an avowment that the defendant "felt bound for the sake of justice and the public to draw the Postmaster-General's attention to the safety of the public Post Office, and that it was for the public benefit that the said matter should be published." The letter to the Postmaster-General which had been declared upon, stated that the letters on which extra postage had been demanded were respectively charged 3d., 4d., and 2d., and it was averred that the defendant, by the said letters, had made statements conveyed an imputation that the charges were extortionate. The defendant's plea, however, did not aver that these charges were extortionate, nor did it state that the charges were not the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General, but that the letter containing the bank bill, there was no avowment of its having been demanded by Gale, or of its being the duty of plaintiff to deliver it to Gale without such demand, or that the letter to the Postmaster-General after the letter in question had arrived there, and awaited delivery. The demurrer to the plea was based upon these contents, as also upon the ground that it contained an avowment of the truth of the statements which it was for the public benefit that the letter containing these charges should be written.

The Attorney-General appeared in support of the demurrer, and Mr. Fancett in support of the plea.

The court considered the demurrer and the plea, and the declaration would be good even if the plea were struck out. It was not disputed that the plea would be bad unless it could be collected from the whole of it that the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the transmission of the letter to the Postmaster-General). Now in the opinion of the court this could not be collected. It was for the declaration to be good, the facts which were set out as amounting to a justification occurred before the publication of the libel (i.e., before the

He was erected for the sufferers of the Charles Haddon which was lost in the Torres Straits some years ago.

Mr. MARTIN said it was impossible to lay down a rule in such a case. This was not a question of precedent. There might have been much more extensive loss of life in various other ways, but though many of the ill-fated passengers of the Dunbar had friends in the colony, others were entire strangers, and he thought it would be just to tribute to raise to the memory of the deceased.

Mr. DONALDSON said there were two questions: the first, the erection of a monument, and the next, the raising of the monument. He was disagreed with the hon. gentleman who said that they were not called upon to act as undertakers in such a case. The circumstances were so peculiar—so painful—so unheard-of—that he thought there was a sufficient reason for going out of their way to do these graceful acts.

Mr. FLOOD thought his hon. friend Mr. Dalley was perfectly correct in the view he had taken. He (Mr. Flood) had known many disasters of an accidental kind, and he thought that the erecting of monuments in these cases was to be acknowledged; they would not know where it should stop. They might go to the flooded districts, or to Newcastle, where it would be equally distressing had occurred. He would be sorry, however, to see the committee divide on this vote.

Mr. PAIKER did not see what particular object would be gained by indicating the burial place of the unfortunate people. It would be sufficient to say that they were there. He thought a simple slab would be sufficient.

Mr. COWPER would admit it was not desirable there should be any extravagant outlay. With respect to the remains, it was not correct that they were so far mutilated as to be unrecognizable. A disinterment in several cases took place. He did think when persons left their homes and were brought into a strange country where no friend was near, it was only right and decent that these last acts should be performed by some means; and hoped that if the House refused this small tribute, it would be undertaken by private subscription.

Mr. DILEY explained that his objection was to the erection of a monument.

Mr. HAY did not think the colony would lose any thing in the estimation of the world by showing its respect for human life. He thought that the warm interest taken in reference to these sufferers was a matter of course.

Mr. THOMAS RUSDEN thought they ought to consider the propriety of this thing. If they raised a tablet of this kind, they must put up a tablet for every man who died in the bush, and every man who died a terrible death in the bush.

Mr. FIDDINGTON supported the vote, provided the tablet or obelisk was erected near the scene of the disaster.

Mr. FLOOD and Mr. COX opposed the vote.

The question was then put and carried, the House having divided with the following result:—Ayes, 18; noes, 7.

Mr. MARTIN moved the following item:—To meet the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. FLOOD contended that the department of the Treasury had received less attention from the General Government than any other department, notwithstanding the fact that it was a public department, and had been made, on more than one occasion, of its bad management. He wished to know whether this small claim arose from the deficiency which had occurred in Mr. Macpherson's time. After proceeding at some length to address the deficiency in the amount of £27 by advances to witnesses, Supreme and Circuit Courts, £1000.

Carried.

Mr. MARTIN moved that the sum of £32 be voted for the purchase of a safe for the safe for holding deeds, and of a cash box, for the Registrar of the Court at Moreton Bay.

Carried.

The following items were put and carried:—

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowance to jurors, £600 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for allowances to witnesses, £1000 0 0

To meet the deficiency in the amount voted for travelling expenses, Quarter sessions, £1000 0 0

Mr. JONES moved that the sum of £6 be voted to meet claim for re-payment, to Mrs. Catherine Donihier, a widow, for the loss of her husband, who died in 1832.

Mr. F

7

RICHARD PEEK has received instructions to sell by public auction, on the Premises, Victoria-terrace, Miller's Point, on **WEDNESDAY, next, 4th November, at 11 o'clock precisely.** All the very superior household furniture, consisting of—
Dining and low tables
Revered card table
English and French easy chairs
Handsome sideboard
Revered chest of drawers
Dressing chairs

Turkey and Brussels carpets
Square grand valises pianoforte
Plated ware, and articles of vertu
Magnificent iron bedsteads—French and English
Horsehair mattresses
Beds, bedding, &c., &c.
Marble washstands.

In the kitchen will be found every requisite for a
class establishment and a very superior Russell's co-
coons, nearly new.

Terms, cash.

Empty Packing Cases,
Telescopes, Watches, Opera Glasses, &c.

THE MESSRS. MOORE will sell by
auction at the Mart, Johns Street, Mo-

THIS DAY, at 11 o'clock,
 30 empty cases
 Superior telescopes
 Dilett opera glasses
 Gold lozengs, and other watches
 Clothing, boots, shoes, and a variety of sundries
 Terms, cash.

MORT and OWEN BALE YARDS.
 Collingwood Railway Station, Liverpool.

MORT and CO. beg to notify that
 have established this Yard, for the
 every description of COLLINGWOOD RAIL
 STATION, LIVERPOOL; and having made the
 complete arrangements to secure and dispose of

supply of water, and convenient yards, with commodious slaughter-house adjoining, every facility will be afforded for the most advantageous disposal of stock committed to their care.

Particulars of availing of these advantages will be given to give at least two clear days notice before arrival of the stock, in order to afford time for the advertising.

All stock intended for the Cullingwood Yards, being by the Northern or Western Roads, will have accommodation afforded them at Rosty Hill, (where we receive yards and an abundant supply of grass) and the convenient facilities of the Cullingwood Yards.

The trains travel five times daily to and fro between Cullingwood and Sydney.

Notes of settlement.
Shew, 12s. per thousand per diem

1900 PRIME FAT WETHERS.
MORT and CO.'s Sale Yards, Collingwood, Liverpool.
Turns at sale.

MORT and CO. have received instructions to sell by public auction, at the Sale Yards, Collingwood, Liverpool, at 12 o'clock, on MONDAY, 19 November.

1900 PRIME FAT WETHERS, in lots to suit buyers.

THE above are from the well-known flock of EDWARD HAMILTON, Esq., of COLLARBOY, and will be found larger and heavier than the lot sold at the same place on 11th November.

NOTICE.—ON THE GROUND, SATURDAY, 31st October, the allotments at Root Grove Farm, will be sold by auction to the highest bidder on liberal terms.

Sale will commence at 12 o'clock.

N.B.—The street lines are varied. Apply for lithos at the Rooms of MOORE and CO., Pitt-street, and your positions prior to the sale.

This unquestionable.

GROSE FARM.—Rochester, adjacent to the University Lands and Grose Farm, is reserved also by public auction, on the ground, on SATURDAY, 31st October.

Apply for lithographs at MOTT and CO.'S Room
street.

Title, unquestionable.

Important Land Sale.

ON THE GROUND, site OCTOBER,
ROCHESTER, part of THE CAMFERDOWN 180
Immediately adjoining GROSE FARM and the
VENERY FARM, with a view of the future
both the MIMMINGDON AND CAMFER
ROADS, the two great connecting thorough-
fares from the Merivons and Parramatta Road.

TITLE, unquestionable.

Printed abstracts now on view at the Rooms
Antiquaries.

MORT and CO. have been instructed to sell by public auction, on the ground of **SATURDAY, 31st October, at 13 o'clock.** That magnificent property known as Rochester, on the Hamming and Camperdown Road, surrounded by the densely populated districts of Camperdown and Millig Terrace, O'Sullivan Row, Kingston, Camphagen, George Street, Newbury, and the City of Sydney. **WIDE and WELL-AREANGED FRUIT** allments having all good fruitage and depth, as follows:—
SECTION A.—21 allments, measuring each to 40 feet frontage, by depths of 114 feet

SECTION R-48 allotments, each from 35 feet
back by 114 to 124 feet.
SECTION C-23 allotments, each from 35 feet
back, frontage, by about 114 feet to 124 feet
depth.

Its proximity to Sydney, and its being surrounded
by some of the oldest and most densely populated suburbs
of New South Wales, give it a very high value. The
city is serviced and supplied by the nearest port.
The most beautiful views in the neighborhood are
from the metropole. The position fronting the Mount
Hood is particularly worthy of notice, as destinations
to be covered with first-class private residences
where the accommodations required for the students of
the University and the various affiliated Colleges, will
be ample furnished.

Rockwater almost adjoins the City boundary, being across the Green Farm Paddock. It is therefore a very handy adapted for the residence of Mechanics and Workmen, who are tied to early hours, and have to walk to work. The TRAMs are also particularly suitable for the purpose.

"6. The wheels of the streetcars and trams have been fastened on the ground by turf lines, and you will find different corners with the names of the streets appearing so that with the aid of lithographic plans, intending passengers may select their lots and make their arrangements prior to the sale.

"7. The streetcars pass at all hours of the day, and at 12 o'clock at night, with a very short delay of 15 minutes, affording easy access to the city, and all parts of the suburbs. It is also almost within sight of the City Hall.

Large Plan of ROOSEVELT now on view at the
First where intending purchasers can
LITHOGRAPHS of the property.
 Issues provided.

Important Sale, Windsor Road.

MR. S. P. DREW has received instructions from the Executors of the late Mr. M. M. KIRBY to sell by auction, at his late Residence, Windsor Road, about nine miles from Windsor, on Monday, the 2nd November, at 12 o'clock, the following property, to-wit:—
 Growing crop, consisting of 2nd year of oats, 1st barley
 3 good draught horses, cart and harness, 3 ploughs

surveys, mines and bridges.
Household furniture, and other effects, too numerous
to mention.

Terms, cash.

For Sale at Campbelltown.
Cows, Horses, and Hogs.

MR. JOHN SHEHA has received in-
structions to sell by public auction, on MON-
day, November 24th, in yards opposite Mr. Michael Prie-
or, Campbelltown.

All head of cattle, chosen as follows—
15 head of broken-in cows, some with young cal-
ves; and some heavy in calf, all quiet milking
head of two-year old heifers, 5 head of 3-

The above lot are remarkably quiet, being all in
 or in call.

TURNS at sale.

In the Supreme Court of New South Wales.
Bank of New South Wales, Sydney, 27th October, 1911.
 Trench and another v. Lucas.

ON TUESDAY, the 3rd of November,
 at noon, at the London Tavern, George-
 street, the Sheriff will come to be said.

The above-named defendant's right, title, and
 interest in the above-mentioned property is
 (other than an equity of redemption) in issue
 all that allotment of land, situate at Bur-

... by the Parliament, containing
one member of an order, upon which is created a
order of four members—where this judgment is
visibly satisfied.

